# MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
Type of Requestor: (X) HCP () IE () IC	<b>Response Timely Filed?</b> (X) Yes () No
Requestor Surgical and Diagnostic Center, LP	MDR Tracking No.: M4-04-2903-01
729 Bedford Euless Road West, Ste. 100 Hurst, TX 76053	TWCC No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent Hartford Underwriters Insurance Co.	Date of Injury:
Rep. Box # 27	Employer's Name: Jackson Construction Inc.
	Insurance Carrier's No.: YBUC 43161

### PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
From	То	- CIT Couc(s) of Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
1-9-03 1-9-03		29880, 93005, 93010	\$2743.59	\$332.00
	1-9-03	Insurance carrier's payment (subtracted)		<\$1118.00>

### PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Our charges are fair and reasonable based on another insurance companies determination of fair and reasonable payments of 85 - 100% of our billed charges. Workers' Compensation carriers are subject to a duty of good faith and fair dealing in the process of worker's compensation claims.

#### PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

The requestor was paid more than a fair and reasonable amount as determined in accordance with the criteria for payment under the Act.

# PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to services provided in an Ambulatory Surgical Center that are not covered under a fee guideline for this date of service. Accordingly, the reimbursement determined through this dispute resolution process must reflect a fair and reasonable rate as directed by Commission Rule 134.1. This case involves a factual dispute about what is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services provided.

On 1-9-03, claimant underwent arthroscopic knee surgery.

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it appears that neither party has provided convincing documentation that sufficiently discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that their purported amount is a fair and reasonable reimbursement (Rule 133.307). After reviewing the services, the charges, and both parties' positions, it is clearly evident that some other amount represents the fair and reasonable reimbursement.

During the rule development process for facility guidelines, the Commission had contracted with Ingenix, a professional firm specializing in actuarial and health care information services, in order to secure data and information on reimbursement ranges for these types of services. The results of this analysis resulted in a recommended range for reimbursement for workers' compensation services provided in these facilities. In addition, we received information from both ASCs and insurance carriers in the recent rule revision process. While not controlling, we considered this information in order to find data related to commercial market payments for these services. This information provides a very good benchmark for determining the "fair and reasonable" reimbursement amount for the services in dispute.

To determine the amount due for this particular dispute, staff compared the procedures in this case to the amounts that would be within the reimbursement range recommended by the Ingenix study (from 192.6% to 256.3% of Medicare for 2003). Staff considered the other information submitted by the parties and the issues related to the specific procedures performed in this dispute. Based on this review and considering the similarity of the various procedures involved in this surgery, staff selected a reimbursement amount in the medium end of the Ingenix range. In addition, the reimbursement for the secondary procedures were reduced by 50% consistent with standard reimbursement approaches. The total amount was then presented to a staff team with health care provider billing and insurance adjusting experience. This team considered the recommended amount, discussed the facts of the individual case, and selected the appropriate "fair and reasonable" amount to be ordered in the final decision.

experienced staff members in Medical Revi	ties' positions, the Ingenix range for applicable priew, we find that the fair and reasonable reimbura a total of \$1118.00 for these services, the health	rsement amount for these services is			
PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION AND ORDER					
entitled to additional reimbursement in	healthcare services, the Medical Review Div the amount of \$332.00. The Division hereb est due at the time of payment to the Reques	by <b>ORDERS</b> the insurance carrier to			
	Elizabeth Pickle, RHIA	August 8, 2005			
Authorized Signature	Typed Name	Date of Order			
Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the Decision and has a right to request a hearing. A request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3). This Decision was mailed to the health care provider and placed in the Austin Representatives box on This Decision is deemed received by you five days after it was mailed and the first working day after the date the Decision was placed in the Austin Representative's box (28 Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744 or faxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this Decision should be attached to the request. The party appealing the Division's Decision shall deliver a copy of their written request for a hearing to the opposing party involved in the dispute.  Si prefiere hablar con una persona in español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.					
PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELI	VERY CERTIFICATION				
	f this Decision and Order in the Austin Repr				
Signature of Insurance Carrier:		Date:			